

## REMARKS

The applicant has received and reviewed the office action of March 18, 2005 wherein the office stated claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Heilig 3,628,829 in view of Simpkins et al. 5,431,569; claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Heilig in view of Simpkins and further in view of Baker et al. The office stated that claims 15-17 were objected to because they were dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if written in independent form.

In regard to the rejection of claims 8-12 on the combination of Heilig 3,628,829 and Simpkins et al. 5,431,569, the applicant points out that office bases the 103 rejection on combination of structural parts from two different devices, neither of which perform applicant's function of isolation of shocks for a user. Each of Heilig and Simpkins are contrary teachings since both of them are for simulating motion (see column 1 lines 5-10 in Simpkins and column lines 4-17 of Heilig). It is submitted that if neither Simpkins or Heilig are for the purpose of isolating shocks as taught by applicant and therefore the combination can not teach the isolating shock as contained in claims 8-12.

In regard to claims 13-14, the office took the position the claims were unpatentable over Heilig in view of Simpkins et al and Further in view of Baker. As pointed out above, Heilig and Simpkins are contrary teachings since both of them are for simulating motion (see column 1 lines 5-10 in Simpkins and column lines 4-17 of Heilig). A review of Baker reveals that he also has a motion simulator system. (see column 1 lines 11-13) It is further submitted that if neither Simpkins, Heilig or Baker are for the purposes of isolating shocks as claimed in claims 13-14 that the combination of Simpkins, Heilig or Baker and therefore can not teach the isolating shock as contained in claims 11-13.

It is noted that claims 15-17 were considered allowable if rewritten; however, it is submitted that base claim 8 is allowable and that claims 15-17 which are dependent on claim 8 are allowable. In summary, claims 8-17 are in allowable condition and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.